

# DISBURSING OFF SHIPS (DOS) PHASE I AND II PROTOTYPE REPORT

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b><i>ii</i></b>
<b>1. BACKGROUND</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
<b>2. NORMAL DISBURSING OPERATIONS AFLOAT</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
<b>3. PROTOTYPE DISBURSING OPERATIONS</b>	<b><i>2</i></b>
<b>4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES</b>	<b><i>2</i></b>
4.1.1. PAY TRANSACTIONS	<i>2</i>
4.1.2. TRAVEL CLAIM PROCESSING	<i>5</i>
4.1.3. MANNING	<i>6</i>
4.1.4. CONNECTIVITY	<i>7</i>
4.1.5. SHORE INFRASTRUCTURE	<i>8</i>
<b>5. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b><i>9</i></b>
5.1. FINDING: DJMS-AC TRANSACTION ERROR RATE DISCREPANCY	<i>10</i>
5.2. FINDING: WEST COAST VS. EAST COAST OPERATIONS	<i>11</i>
5.3. FINDING: TRAVEL CLAIM PROCESSING TIME	<i>12</i>
5.4. FINDING: DK SEA/SHORE ROTATION IMPACT	<i>13</i>
5.5. FINDING: DK MANNING END STRENGTH	<i>14</i>
5.6. FINDING: DK & PN RATING MERGER	<i>15</i>
5.7. FINDING: CONNECTIVITY	<i>17</i>
5.8. FINDING: REQUIRED HARDWARE	<i>18</i>
5.9. FINDING: PHASE II: EXPANSION TO MULTIPLE SHIPS	<i>19</i>
5.10. FINDING: PHASE III: EXPANSION TO INCLUDE PERSONNEL (PAPA)	<i>20</i>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
Points of Contact	<i>1</i>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
Disbursing Off Ships Standard Operating Procedures	<i>1</i>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
Transaction Flow Charts	<i>1</i>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
Consolidated EARS and DJMS Data	<i>1</i>
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
Transaction Error Rate Line Graphs	<i>1</i>
<b>Appendix F</b>	<b><i>1</i></b>
ASDOF Project POM Issue Paper	<i>1</i>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

During 1999, the Afloat Supply Department of the Future (ASDOF) committee conceptualized transferring shipboard military pay and travel functions to shore-based facilities. The objective was to reduce workload afloat while providing as good as or better military pay and travel services to the sailor at the deck plate level. Under the direction of the ASDOF committee, Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP), Commander Naval Surface Forces Atlantic Fleet (CNSL) and Commander Naval Surface Forces Pacific Fleet (CNSP) conducted the initial prototype phase onboard USS TORTUGA and USS BON HOMME RICHARD from December 1999 through April 2000. ASDOF named the prototype Disbursing Off Ships (DOS).

Phase I proved the feasibility of transferring Disbursing Clerks (DKs) and workload from ships to beach detachments at shore locations (PSA/PSD) where all military pay and travel entitlement transactions for their ship were processed. Transaction error processing rates improved overall and travel claim processing times improved up to 80%. No degradation to customer service was noted. Ten findings were identified and recommendations were developed to facilitate future expansion and management of this initiative.

Finding 5.1, DJMS-AC Transaction Error Rate Discrepancy, identified a DJMS report generation error that inflated reported transaction error rates system-wide. DFAS corrected the error in June 2000. Finding 5.2 studies operational differences between the classes of ships. Finding 5.3 discusses travel claim processing time and indicates that Navy should transfer travel claims processing to shore detachments, provided that adequate resources can be provided, to immediately improve (reduce) travel claims processing time.

Findings 5.4 through 5.6 discuss manning issues related to sea/shore rotations, promotions, PN and DK rate commonality, and end strengths. Hardware and connectivity issues are discussed in Findings 5.7 and 5.8.

Finding 5.9 discusses expanding the study to additional ships in a second phase. In May 2000, CNSL and CNSP initiated Phase II and expanded the prototype to two more LSD's on the East Coast and one more LHD on the West Coast. Phase II results were similar to Phase I, showing the feasibility of transferring pay and travel functions ashore.

Finding 5-10 discusses a third phase under consideration that would expand the scope to include personnel functions. The third phase is known as Pay and Personnel Ashore (PAPA). PAPA is expected to demonstrate the commonality of the DK and PN rates along with providing additional manpower savings in the personnel administration area.

This prototype is a Quality of Life (QOL) initiative.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

During 1999, the ASDOF committee, sanctioned by CNSL and CNSP to develop ideas to improve supply processes and quality of life (QOL) for sailors aboard the ships of the future, conceptualized transferring shipboard military pay and travel functions to shore-based facilities. The objective was to reduce workload afloat while providing as good as or better military pay and travel services to the sailor at the deck plate level. Subsequently, under the direction of ASDOF committee, NAVSUP, CNSL and CNSP conducted a prototype, named “Disbursing Off Ships (DOS),” to test the concept feasibility. Points of Contact and working group members are detailed in Appendix (A).

Phase I of DOS commenced in December 1999 and concluded in April 2000. The designated prototype ships were USS TORTUGA (LSD-46), based on the east coast, and the USS BON HOMME RICHARD (LHD-6), based on the west coast. PSD Little Creek, VA and PSA San Diego, CA were designated supporting shore activities on the east and west coasts respectively. Disbursing processes were modified to divide and transfer disbursing workload from the ship to the supporting shore activity. In addition, Disbursing Clerks (DKs) were transferred from each ship to its supporting shore activity. Working ashore, the ship’s force DKs received and processed all military and travel pay transactions generated and transmitted by their ship and submitted transactions to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) as appropriate.

Based on Phase I experience, Phase II was initiated and expanded the scope to three additional ships. Phase II was conducted from May through September 2000. The USS BOXER (LHD-4) was added to PSA San Diego and the USS CARTER HALL (LSD-50) and USS GUNSTON HALL (LSD-44) were added to PSD Little Creek.

All ships spent time in homeport and on deployment during the prototype and thereby had thoroughly tested disbursing transaction transmissions from geographic locations throughout the world. Disbursing transactions were transmitted to the supporting shore activity via email or SALTS while deployed and when located in homeport.

The Phase I and II of the prototype proved the feasibility of the DOS concept and produced ten findings and associated recommendations for the continuation of the initiative to transfer disbursing functions from ships to shore-based activities. Under consideration is a third phase that transfers some personnel and administration functions along with disbursing functions to shore facilities. The third phase is known as Pay and Personnel Ashore (PAPA).

## **2. NORMAL DISBURSING OPERATIONS AFLOAT**

Today, the ship’s Disbursing Office (Disbursing), a division of the ship’s Supply Department, generates, validates and performs all pay-related transactions. Reporting to the ship’s Supply Officer, the Disbursing Officer (DO) is responsible for maintaining accurate pay accounts for all ship’s force personnel and the efficient management of general disbursing operations and division personnel. Besides a Division Officer, seven DKs are typically assigned to a LHD and two to a LSD, including both senior and junior DK personnel.

Disbursing performs numerous transactions on a daily basis that affect the Master Military Pay Accounts (MMPA). The DKs compute, document, and pay all pays and allowances, maintain Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) and local safekeeping accounts, reconcile Leave and Earnings Statements (LESS), and handle all customer service inquiries including solving pay problems. A range of different disbursing transactions are generated, processed and transmitted directly to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) for posting to the member's MMPA. Disbursing processes affect many other administrative processes performed by the ship's Personnel Office and the Command Career Counselor (CCC) and, conversely, transactions performed by the Personnel Office and the CCC affect Disbursing. Consequently, Disbursing, Personnel and the CCC typically interact closely to provide overall quality disbursing and administrative support to the sailor at the deck plates.

### **3. PROTOTYPE DISBURSING OPERATIONS**

In the "to be" or prototype state, basic disbursing processes remain unchanged, however, the responsibility to perform the processes was divided between the afloat Disbursing office and the supporting shore activity. The division of the process responsibilities is detailed in Appendix (B). Aboard ship, Disbursing essentially becomes a transaction reporter. The DK interfaces with the customer to initiate various pay transactions or requests, collects and attaches supporting documentation, then, transmits the information to his counterpart located at the supporting shore activity for processing and further transmittal to DFAS. Aboard ship, the DK continues to maintain ATMs, perform cash collections, manage the office, pay bills, and provide general customer support functions including interacting as required with Personnel and the CCC. Ashore, the DK receives the disbursing transactions transmitted from the ship and processes the transaction in the normal way, including transmission to DFAS. Additionally, the shore activity provides transaction feedback to the ship. Appendix (C) contains graphical representation of the transaction flow during the prototype.

### **4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES**

Data for this analysis was provided by CNSL, CNSP and PSA San Diego or extracted from the Defense Joint Military Pay System – Active Component (DJMS-AC) Performance Accuracy Reports and the Evaluation and Analysis Reporting System (EARS). Appendix (D) summarizes statistical data and reports accumulated during the prototype for each ship.

#### **4.1.1. PAY TRANSACTIONS**

Table 4.1.1.1 presents Phase I average transaction error rates reported by DJMS for each ship prior to and during the prototype period and average transaction counts. In addition, EARS transaction error rates reported by the ship/type commander (TYCOM) during the prototype are presented. EARS data was not available for the periods prior to the prototype. Transaction error rate are graphically presented in line graphs contained in Appendix (E).

Transaction error rates shown in Table 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.2 exclude recycled transactions because of an ongoing error in the DJMS-AC Performance Accuracy Report generation process that incorrectly counted transaction rejections (errors) multiple times, inflating the recycled counts and overstating error rates (when recycled counts are included). This reporting error affected all

ships and shore stations. The report was corrected in June 2000 and the DJMS-AC transaction error rates dropped Navy-wide. Retroactive correction of the historical DJMS reports is not feasible. The DJMS reject rates in Table 4.1.1.1 were calculated by dividing the number of rejected transactions (partial and complete, excluding recycled) by the total number of transactions (excluding recycled) that were submitted for processing during the period. For comparison purposes, reject rates that include the recycled component are also displayed in the line graphs contained in Appendix (E).

During Phase I, TORTUGA recorded an overall error rate increase of 0.5% as measured by EARS and 15.5% as measured by DJMS. TORTUGA processed 701 transactions per month on average. DJMS data showed TORTUGA recorded unusually high error rates in February and April. Excluding these anomalies from TORTUGA's error rate calculation, error rates in the 2% range would have been recorded.

BON HOMME RICHARD recorded an overall error rate decrease of 5.1% as measured by EARS and 3.7% as measured by DJMS. BON HOMME RICHARD processed 2774 transactions per month on average.

<b>TABLE 4.1.1.1</b>					
<b>Phase I - Transaction Error Rates (Dec – Apr)</b>					
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>EARS Baseline (11/29/00) (%)</b>	<b>EARS Phase I Average (%)</b>	<b>DJMS Baseline (11/29/00) (%)</b>	<b>DJMS Phase I Average (%)</b>	<b>DJMS Average Monthly Transaction Count</b>
<b>TORTUGA</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>701</b>
<b>BON HOMME RICHARD</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2774</b>

As summarized in Table 4.1.1.2 below, during Phase II, TORTUGA recorded an average error rate decrease of 5.0% as measured by EARS and 3.2% as measured DJMS, calculated from the 29 November baseline. TORTUGA processed 514 transactions on average per month. In EARS, an error rate spike was erroneously recorded in August that overstated reported average error rates. This spike was caused when PSD Little Creek Beach Detachment inadvertently processed 30 rejected USS PORTLAND transactions using TORTUGA's ADSN. Correcting for this anomaly, TORTUGA's actual EARS reject rate for August would have been zero and the average for Phase II would have been 0.6% vice 2.0%. In DJMS, extraordinarily high error rates were recorded for TORTUGA in February, April and July, and also resulted in overstated error rates. Correcting for these anomalies in DJMS, TORTUGA's error rates would have been closer to 2.0% vice 7.2%. See Appendix (D).

During Phase II, BON HOMME RICHARD recorded an average error rate decrease of 1.9% as measured by EARS and a 2.1% increase as measured by DJMS, calculated from the 29 November baseline. In both EARS and DJMS, an error rate spike was recorded in June that overstated BON HOMME RICHARD's average error rates. This anomaly was caused by the unintentional release of a mass transaction to post "stop CTZE" during June. Excluding this

anomaly from the calculation, BON HOMME RICHARD would have recorded error rates in the 2.0% percent range vice 4 to 7% range, see Appendix (D).

For the three ships added in Phase II, the baseline for the average error rate calculations changed to 30 May for the BOXER and 30 April for CARTER HALL and GUNTON HALL.

BOXER recorded an average error rate decrease of 0.2% as measured by EARS and 0.9% as measured by DJMS. BOXER processed 2,225 transactions monthly on average.

CARTER HALL recorded an average error rate decrease of 0.5% as measured by EARS and 2.1% as measured by DJMS. CARTER HALL processed 576 transactions monthly on average.

GUNSTON HALL recorded an average error rate increase by 0.5% as measured by EARS and 15.8% decrease as measured by DJMS. GUNSTON HALL processed 463 transaction monthly on average. The disparity between rates recorded by DJMS and EARS was caused by an unusually high number of rejects (4 times normal) recorded by DJMS during April but not by EARS. Excluding this anomaly, DJMS would have reported error rates in the 7% range for GUNSTON HALL.

This data is graphically presented in Appendix (E).

<b>TABLE 4.1.1.2</b>					
<b>Phase II- Transaction Error Rates (May – Sep)</b>					
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>EARS Baseline (%)</b>	<b>EARS Phase II Average (%)</b>	<b>DJMS Baseline (%)</b>	<b>DJMS Phase II Average (%)</b>	<b>DJMS Average Monthly Transaction Count</b>
<b>TORTUGA</b>	<b>7.0</b> (11/29/00)	<b>2.0</b>	<b>10.4</b> (11/29/00)	<b>7.2</b>	<b>514</b>
<b>BON HOMME RICHARD</b>	<b>6.1</b> (11/29/00)	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5.6</b> (11/29/00)	<b>7.7</b>	<b>3644</b>
<b>BOXER</b>	<b>1.3</b> (5/30/00)	<b>1.1</b>	<b>2.1</b> (5/30/00)	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2225</b>
<b>CARTER HALL</b>	<b>1.0</b> (4/30/00)	<b>0.5</b>	<b>5.1</b> (4/30/00)	<b>3.0</b>	<b>576</b>
<b>GUNSTON HALL</b>	<b>0.0</b> (4/30/00)	<b>0.5</b>	<b>22.9</b> (4/30/00)	<b>7.1</b>	<b>463</b>

For comparison purposes, Table 4.1.1.3 shows transaction error rate averages experienced by the Fleet, CONUS and OCONUS shore units. Except for the CONUS shore category, the prototype ships performed better than average.

<b>Table 4.1.1.3</b>		
<b>Overall Average Transaction Error Rates</b>		
<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>DJMS FY-99 (%)</b>	<b>DJMS FY-00 (%)</b>
<b>NAVY WIDE</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>7.7</b>
<b>FLEET</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>8.3</b>
<b>CONUS SHORE</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>
<b>OCONUS SHORE</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>7.5</b>

In general, the DOS prototype resulted in slightly lower transaction error rates overall, however, a large degree of variability in data and error rates reported by EARS and DJMS was also documented, see Appendix (D). Consequently, DOS Prototype Phase I and II did not produce compelling evidence that transaction error rates could be significantly and permanently reduced as a result of transferring pay functions ashore.

#### **4.1.2. TRAVEL CLAIM PROCESSING**

CNSL and CNSP reported Phase I average travel claims processed and average processing time for each ship. These values are shown in Table 4.1.2.1. The disparity between the average processing times for East and West Coast ships is caused primarily by the method used to measure elapsed time by CNSP and CNSL. CNSP measures elapsed time from the time the travel claim is received at the supporting shore activity (PSA) until the time the supporting shore activity transmits to DFAS. CNSL measures elapsed time from the time the travel claim is received at the supporting shore activity (PSD) until the date the EFT payment is reported by DFAS. Including the DFAS processing time results in longer elapsed times for the East Coast ships compared to the West Coast ships.

<b>Table 4.1.2.1</b>			
<b>Phase I - Average Travel Claim Processing Time</b>			
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>Average Travel Claims Per Month</b>	<b>Average Processing Time <u>Before</u> Prototype (days)</b>	<b>Average Processing Time <u>During</u> Prototype (days)</b>
<b>TORTUGA</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>BON HOMME RICHARD</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

As Table 4.1.2.2 indicates, Phase II achieved results similar to Phase I. In addition, the statistics did not vary significantly throughout the prototype.

<b>Table 4.1.2.2</b>				
<b>Phase II - Average Travel Claim Processing Time</b>				
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>Average Travel Claims Per Month</b>	<b>Average Processing Time <u>Before</u> Prototype (days)</b>	<b>Average Processing Time <u>During</u> Prototype (days)</b>	<b>Reduction in Processing Time (%)</b>
<b>TORTUGA</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>BON HOMME RICHARD</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>BOXER</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>CARTER HALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>GUNSTON HALL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Study Average</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>62</b>

The data shows that BON HOMME RICHARD decreased travel claim processing times by 80%, TORTUGA by 71%, BOXER by 80%, CARTER HALL by 25% and GUNSTON HALL by 55%. Decreased travel claim processing time was the most significant process improvement demonstrated by the prototype, in either Phase. This improvement was attributed to better communications connectivity ashore and the lack of extracurricular shipboard duties at the supporting shore activities that hinder the DKs ability to process travel claims when onboard the ship, for example, standing operational watches, flooding/fire drills and compartment cleaning.

#### **4.1.3 MANNING**

To identify possible opportunities to transform disbursing processes and reduce manning onboard ships, NAVSUP requested an analysis of the DK and Personnelman (PN) ratings from the Navy Manpower Analysis Center (NAVMAC). The objective was to document the functional commonality between the rates and quantify DK and PN workload changes resulting from advances in automation during the past several years. NAVMAC's initial baseline report showed the DK and PN ratings have 20% commonality among tasks performed today, but from a functional perspective, were significantly different. On that basis, NAVMAC recommended against merging these ratings. In response to a follow up request from NAVSUP, NAVMAC agreed to reassess functional commonality between the rates based on updated occupational standards and, in October 2000, published new findings and reversed their earlier position, recommending that the ratings be merged.

Table 4.1.3 shows the change in the DK manning structure for ships in Phase I and II and the average number of pay records managed by each DK. In Phase I, one of two DKs transferred to PSD Little Creek from TORTUGA and three of seven DKs transferred from BONHOMME RICHARD to PSA San Diego. Approximately 330 pay records per DK were managed for TORTUGA by PSD Little Creek. PSA San Diego managed approximately 429 pay records per DK for BONHOMME RICHARD. PSD Little Creek absorbed the management oversight of the additional DKs for TORTUGA. On the West Coast, BONHOMME RICHARD transferred a senior DK to PSA San Diego to provide management oversight in addition to two junior DKs who handled most of the pay records. In Phase II, CARTER HALL and GUNSTON HALL



were added to the East Coast however only one additional DK was transferred to PSD Little Creek. The average of pay records per DK increased to approximately 495. The BOXER was added to the West Coast, increasing the PSA San Diego team by three DKs and increasing the average pay records per DK to 525. Of the six DKs at PSA San Diego, one provided supervision, one handled travel claims and four handled pay records. According to NAVMAC, on a Navy-wide basis, the average number of pay records managed by a single DK is 290.

<b>Table 4.1.3</b>				
<b>DK Manning VS. NBR of Pay Records</b>				
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>Total DKs Authorized Afloat</b>	<b>Number of DKs Ashore</b>	<b>Percentage of DKs Transferred Ashore</b>	<b>Average Records per DK Ashore</b>
<b>Phase I:</b>				
<b>East Coast</b>			<b>50%</b>	<b>~330</b>
<b>TORTUGA</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>West Coast</b>			<b>43%</b>	<b>~429</b>
<b>BON HOMME RICHARD</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>Phase II:</b>				
<b>East Coast</b>			<b>33%</b>	<b>~495</b>
<b>TORTUGA</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>CARTER HALL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>GUNSTON HALL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>West Coast</b>			<b>43%</b>	<b>~525</b>
<b>BON HOMME RICHARD</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>BOXER</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>Study Total (Phase II)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>~510</b>

The data shows that DK's, operating in this prototype working environment, managed significantly more pay records than the average DK and did so with no degradation in accuracy or efficiency. These results indicate that maintaining as good as or better customer support afloat after reducing DK manning levels is highly probable.

#### **4.1.4. CONNECTIVITY**

While at sea, connectivity between the ship and its supporting shore activity was established via the ship's existing LAN structure, SALTS, narrow or wideband commercial satellite communications, the INTERNET and a new device know as a digital sender. Similar to a facsimile machine, a digital sender quickly converts paper copy (disbursing forms and information) into electronic files that are transmittable via the LAN and INTERNET. One digital sender was installed at each supporting shore activity and onboard each ship. While in port, digital senders were utilized to create the electronic files but transmission was typically via telephone modem or hard copy packages were simply hand-carried to the supporting shore

activity. No changes were required to the pre-existing connectivity between DFAS and the supporting shore activity, which is via the INTERNET.

The communications hardware and software employed in the prototype is summarized in Table 4.1.4.

<b>Table 4.1.4</b>			
<b>Prototype Communications Hardware and Software</b>			
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>Connectivity At Sea</b>	<b>Connectivity In Port</b>	<b>Software</b>
<b><u>LSD</u> TORTUGA, CARTER HALL, GUNSTON HALL</b>	<b>Digital Sender, IMARSAT B</b>	<b>Digital Sender, Telephone Modem, or hand-carry</b>	<b>WINSALTS, DYNACOMM ELITE</b>
<b><u>LHD</u> BON HOMME RICHARD, BOXER</b>	<b>Digital Sender, IT-21, CHALLENGE ATHENA</b>	<b>Digital Sender, Telephone Modem, or hand-carry</b>	<b>DYNACOMM ELITE</b>

IT-21 refers to the Local Area Network (LAN) configuration maintained on the ship and the associated standards and policy of the Fleet. IMARSAT B refers to the International Maritime Satellite communications system typically employed on small ships for administrative communications. Challenge Athena is a commercial wideband satellite communication system supporting high data rate transfer. WINSALTS is the Windows based version of the Streamlined Alternative Logistics Transmission System (SALTS) utilized throughout the Navy to handle administrative email communications and file transfers between ships and the INTERNET. DYNACOMM ELITE is a Windows based application that provides connectivity to DJMS-AC via the INTERNET.

TORTUGA had the IT-21 solution installed in April 2000, during the middle of Phase I. Prior to IT-21 installation, they experienced recurring connectivity problems that affected the timeliness and accuracy of data transmissions.

Overall, IT-21 communications and connectivity were highly reliable throughout the prototype, both Phase I and II. It should be noted that the prototype was not tested during a high-tempo operational environment such as combat operations or under minimize (communications traffic) conditions. Under these conditions, low priority administrative communications traffic, such as disbursing, can be stopped or significantly curtailed. Under these unusual operational circumstances, elapsed time to process disbursing transactions and general customer support could be negatively affected.

#### **4.1.5. SHORE INFRASTRUCTURE**

PSA San Diego and PSD Little Creek required office space for the additional DKs assigned to them from the ships and associated furniture, phone lines, computer workstations, LAN drops and the digital sender.

Because the communications infrastructure was largely pre-existing, costs associated with establishing communications were limited to purchasing the digital senders for each location and adding LAN drops at PSA San Diego for three DKs from the BON HOMME RICHARD and later, in Phase II, the three DKs from BOXER. PSA San Diego also needed to create office space and to purchase furniture and computer workstations. PSD Little Creek absorbed the additional two DKs within their existing LAN and office capacity without any additional costs. CNSL procured two computer workstations, a fax/modem and an additional phone line to support the PSD Little Creek Beach Detachment. Costs totaled approximately \$25,000.

Utilizing pre-existing LAN and communications circuits for data communications; the ships did not require any additional infrastructure changes with the exception of installing the digital sender. Since manning numbers were reduced, no additional office space or LAN drops were required aboard ship.

## **5. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The DOS prototype was executed successfully and demonstrated the feasibility of transferring disbursing functions from ships to supporting shore activities. Phase I and II surfaced several findings. These findings are addressed within this section of the report and should be adequately addressed prior to expanding the DOS initiative fleet-wide.

## **5.1. FINDING: DJMS-AC TRANSACTION ERROR RATE DISCREPANCY**

### **DISCUSSION**

Data analyses by CNSL and NAVSUP identified a large disparity in transaction processing error rates reported by EARS and DJMS-AC for the TORTUGA and BON HOMME RICHARD. An investigation by CNSL (N41) and DFAS attributed the disparity to an errant DJMS report query that counted transaction rejections (errors) multiple times and resulted in overstated transaction processing error rates on the DJMS Performance Accuracy Reports. This reporting error affected all ships and shore stations. The DJMS-AC database was not corrupted; however, retroactive correction of the historical reports is not feasible. The DJMS report query logic was corrected and, as of June 2000, Performance Accuracy Reports show accurate transaction reporting statistics.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Correct report query to eliminate recycled count from error rate.

### **STATUS**

1. DFAS corrected the report query in June 2000. Since then, transaction error rates reported by DJMS more consistently reflect error rates reported by EARS. Action complete.

## **5.2. FINDING: WEST COAST VS. EAST COAST OPERATIONS**

### **DISCUSSION**

Both West and East Coast ships and supporting shore activities successfully performed the prototype disbursing operations. The most distinguishing factor that indicated any difference in operating capability is the transaction processing error rate. Transaction error rates of the different ships demonstrate a relatively large amount of variability. This variability can be considered relatively insignificant because the historical transaction error rates have shown a comparable degree of variation. Nonetheless, close management oversight ashore and afloat was key to success on both coasts. CNSL and CNSP documented each ship's results in progress with statistical reports. This documentation is summarized in Appendix (D). The basic reports are on file and available for review from NAVSUP 056.

Another factor affecting operational performance involved equipment. Early on, the West Coast activities adopted the digital sender technology that improved accuracy and speed of transferring disbursing documents and information. Later in the prototype, based on the West Coast experience, the East Coast activities replaced the standard flat bed scanner technology with digital senders and began to achieve similar efficiencies.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Employ digital sender technology exclusively for disbursing document transmission until this function can be replaced by automation.
2. Standardize disbursing data/document transmission schedules and transmit multiple times per day to minimize file size and disperse the demand for satellite bandwidth.
3. Automate disbursing data/information transfer between ship and shore and retire the digital sender technology to reduce communications bandwidth demand and improve accuracy (single point of data input).

### **5.3. FINDING: TRAVEL CLAIM PROCESSING TIME**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Travel claim processing clearly proved to be a function that could be significantly improved by transfer to a supporting shore facility. The elapsed time for travel claim processing experienced in Phase I and II decreased between 55% and 80%. All ships achieved similar results.

CNSL and CNSP attribute the improvement in travel claim processing time to two factors, communications and work routines on board ships. At sea, DKs are constrained by minimize conditions, operational tempo, ship's geographical location and satellite availability. These shipboard environmental factors inhibit the DKs capability to process and transmit travel claims to DFAS in a consistent and expeditious manner. Ashore, these factors have little impact. During at sea periods, the DK's work routine may be disrupted by ship's activities and military duties, for example, watchstanding, drills, field days and maintenance activities. In contrast, the shore-based DK can consistently dedicate his whole workday to processing travel claims.

The status of travel claim processing and personnel administration automation is also a key consideration in a decision to transfer travel claim processing ashore. Today, the shipboard Disbursing Office uses a DOS-based legacy system known as the Integrated Automated Travel System (IATS) to process travel claims. The Defense Travel System (DTS), DOD's standard travel system, may eventually replace IATS. However, there are no current plans to implement DTS on board ships because DTS is a web-based system and the INTERNET/Web is not available to all ships when at sea. In addition, the Navy will begin implementing the Navy Standard Integrated Personnel System (NSIPS) in FY-02. NSIPS is installed on the DK's primary workstation but currently is not compatible with IATS in its present form. A significant amount of costly system modification and development would be necessary to continue using IATS after NSIPS is deployed or to implement DTS onboard ships.

Consequently, neither IATS nor DTS provide viable cost-effective long-term solutions for automating travel claim processing on board ships. Transferring travel claim processing ashore reduces response times to the customer, which improves QOL, and is an economically viable alternative by avoiding life cycle costs associated with integrating DTS and NSIPS for shipboard use.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Although transfer of travel pay and claims processing to PSA/PSD can significantly improve processing time and could potentially avoid certain systems development costs, this initiative should be studied further to determine the impact on shipboard communications resources, personnel and manning, and shore-based supporting infrastructure before making an implementation decision.

## 5.4. FINDING: DK SEA/SHORE ROTATION IMPACT

### DISCUSSION

At the ASDOF summit in July 2000, CNSL N411 reported that a 40% reduction in DK sea duty billets (approx. 386 billets) was potentially attainable if all shipboard disbursing functions were transferred to shore activities. Table 5.4 illustrates the proposed billet structure if the full 40% reduction was achieved.

As a consequence of implementing the DOS prototype Navy-wide, the DK rate could be dramatically affected. With significantly fewer sea billets available, the DK's opportunity to become warfare qualified, acquire special qualifications such as, Officer of the Deck (OOD), Junior Officer of the DECK (JOOD), Damage Control, 3M, and others will be dramatically curtailed. As these special qualifications are highly valued prerequisites for advancement, especially to senior enlisted ranks, the DK rating will be placed at a significant disadvantage competing for promotion and with peers in other rates.

There is also concern that movement of DK billets ashore will affect sea/shore rotations by increasing the risk of losing billets to contractors as a result of an A-76 study.

To prevent institutionalizing these disadvantages, the DK career path and advancement requirements should be revised to reflect the change in sea billet to shore billet ratios and keep the DK competitive with other rates.

<b>Table 5.4</b>		
<b>DK Billets</b>		
	<b>SEA</b>	<b>SHORE</b>
<b>CURRENT</b>	964	551
<b>PROPOSED</b>	578	937

### RECOMMENDATION

1. Quantify full impact after completion of DOS Phase III.

## 5.5. FINDING: DK MANNING END STRENGTH

### DISCUSSION

Phase I simply transferred existing DKs from the prototype ships to shore activities to provide support directly to their respective ships. Overall manpower reductions were not initially tested or achieved. However, acknowledging the initial success of the prototype, CNSL and CNSP expanded the prototype to three additional ships. In May 2000, CNSL started testing overall manning reduction by transferring two instead of three DKs to PSD Little Creek to support three LSD class ships. PSA San Diego picked up another three DKs from BOXER in Phase II bringing the total to six DKs handling pay records for two LHD class ships. However, only four DKs' actually handled the pay records. One of the six DKs handled travel claims and one provided close management oversight. This indicates that an overall 11% reduction in manning is possible and potentially one billet could be eliminated for every nine DK sea billets.

Assuming that an 11% reduction proves feasible, it is possible to reduce the overall DK end strength and absorb all or part of the current Navy-wide 13% DK manning deficiency. Table 5.5 summarizes statistical manning and billet data provided by BUPERS as of July 2000. The supporting statistical reports are on file and available for review from NAVSUP 056.

<b>Table 5.5</b>					
<b>DK Manning</b>					
<b>RANK</b>	<b>AUTH. #</b>	<b>CURRENT INVENTORY (#)</b>	<b>MANNING STRENGTH (%)</b>	<b>MANNING ASHORE (%)</b>	<b>MANNING AFLOAT (%)</b>
E-1-E-3	311	169	54	10	59
E-4	422	283	67	33	67
E-5	520	550	106	95	106
E-6	354	379	107	113	104
E-7	107	102	95	89	108
E-8	34	31	91	136	75
E-9	11	15	136	70	250
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1759</b>	<b>1529</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>110</b>

### RECOMMENDATION

1. Request that NAVMAC conduct a formal study that includes a Job Task Analysis (JTA) to document DK workload, occupational standards, and manning level requirements for transferring all military pay and travel claim processing from ships to supporting shore activities.
2. Re-assess manning issues after completion of the Phase III study and the NAVMAC JTA.



## 5.6 FINDING: DK & PN RATING MERGER

### DISCUSSION

The overlap of DK and PN functions and tasks was not considered in the initial prototype, however, the study surfaced the merging of these rates as a potential next logical step and the ASDOF committee sanctioned the inclusion of the PN rate in the third phase of the prototype. As discussed earlier, NAVSUP requested that NAVMAC perform a study based on current workload environment, occupational standards and information processing automation. The objective was to revise and document the functional commonality between the DK and PN rates and to quantify the impact of information automation that has occurred during the past several years.

The initial NAVMAC study showed 20% functional commonality and recommended not combining the rates. The study, however, was based on relatively outdated occupation and workload standards. NAVMAC revised the study and in October 2000 reversed its earlier position by recommending that the rates could be merged. Before any final decisions can be made regarding merging these rates, the concept must be thoroughly studied and approved by NAVPERS and the Fleet Commanders.

Tables 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 summarize manning and billet data and show inventory levels and available billets for both PN's and DK's as of July 2000. Additional supporting data is available for review from NAVSUP 056.

<b>Table 5.6.1</b>										
<b>DK/PN MANNING STRENGTH</b>										
<b>RANK</b>	<b>AUTH. #</b>		<b>CURRENT INVENTORY</b>		<b>MANNING STRENGTH</b>		<b>MANNING ASHORE</b>		<b>MANNING AFLOAT</b>	
	<b>DK (#)</b>	<b>PN (#)</b>	<b>DK (#)</b>	<b>PN (#)</b>	<b>DK (%)</b>	<b>PN (%)</b>	<b>DK (%)</b>	<b>PN (%)</b>	<b>DK (%)</b>	<b>PN (%)</b>
E-1-E-3	311	534	169	356	54	67	10	59	59	52
E-4	422	688	283	816	67	119	33	85	67	137
E-5	520	867	550	781	106	90	95	91	106	80
E-6	354	877	379	880	107	100	113	84	104	117
E-7	107	496	102	407	95	82	89	78	108	79
E-8	34	89	31	105	91	118	136	115	75	140
E-9	11	37	15	34	136	92	70	105	250	77

<b>Table 5.6.2</b>		
<b>DK/PN SEA &amp; SHORE BILLET NUMBERS</b>		
	<b>SEA</b>	<b>SHORE</b>
<b>PN</b>	1646	1847
<b>DK</b>	964	551

### RECOMMENDATION

1. Evaluate merging DK and PN rates through appropriately commissioned studies after completion of DOS Phase III.

## **5.7. FINDING: CONNECTIVITY**

### **DISCUSSION**

Connectivity in port was accomplished via telephone modem, and, at sea, via satellite communications (IMARSAT B or Challenge Athena). The prototype was not conducted in a high-tempo operational environment such as during combat operations or under “Minimize” conditions, circumstances that limit administrative communications to and from the ship. At sea, frequent but small data file transfers proved more reliable than single daily batch updates that necessitated large file transfers.

During the prototype, TORTUGA experienced communication problems related to poor communications pier side and a fluctuation of those assets from pier to pier within the same port. This problem was overcome by requesting berths for the ship with the best communication assets.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. SPAWAR (PMW176), FLEETS (N6) and TYCOM's must ensure that communications bandwidth is available and that disbursing data file transfer processes are standardized to satisfactorily support the transfer of disbursing operations from ships to supporting shore activities.
2. SPAWAR (PMW158) and Fleet (N6) must ensure that Disbursing has a LAN drop to accommodate installation of digital senders. Implementation may require adding a requirement to NTCSS LAN on the small ships.

### **STATUS**

1. CINCLANTFLT N-60 has a contract in place to upgrade pierside communications. NAB Little Creek is scheduled for upgrade between September 2000 to May 2001.

## **5.8. FINDING: REQUIRED HARDWARE**

### **DISCUSSION**

The Hewlett Packard (HP) Digital Sender was the only additional hardware required on board the ship. The HP digital sender provides high-speed document scan and file transfer capabilities compared to flat bed scanners or faxes. Two units were required onboard ship, one was installed and one was reserved as a back-up unit. At the shore activities, one HP digital sender was installed at each activity. In addition, at PSA San Diego installed LAN drops and computer workstations for the DKs transferred from the BON HOMME RICHARD and BOXER in Phase II. PSD Little Creek had the LAN and office capacity to absorb the two DKs transferred from the ships without any additional costs. Currently the IT-21 solution is not employed on all LSD's. TORTUGA installed IT-21 in April 2000, which enhanced data communications in support of Phase I of this test. Expansion of the prototype to other ships will involve additional installation and hardware costs. The cost is dependent on the existing ADP configurations on the ship and shore activity.

Fleet (N6) imposes stringent requirements and procurement controls for ADP hardware installed on board ships. Care must be taken to ensure compliance with all applicable regulations and specifications.

The cost per ship to install this hardware is estimated at \$8,000 (excluding LAN drops).

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Coordinate with the Fleet (N-6) to ensure that all ADP systems and hardware requirements are approved and meet all applicable configuration standards.
2. Include requirement for a LAN drop into the Disbursing Office to IT21/NTCSS LAN architecture for all surface ship classes.

### 5.9. FINDING: PHASE II: EXPANSION TO MULTIPLE SHIPS

#### DISCUSSION

CNSF and CNSP started a second phase of this prototype in May 2000, expanding to three other ships within the same ship class and homeport. Phase II produced results similar to Phase I, primarily decreased transaction error processing rates and significantly reduced travel claim processing times. In addition, CNSL successfully employed only two DKs at PSD Little Creek to support all three ships. This aspect of the prototype suggests that workload synergies are available and can be developed at the shore activities, providing for a small reduction in the number of DKs overall. The tables below illustrate the distribution of the DKs during the phase two of the prototype.

<b>Table 5.9.1</b>		
<b>CNSL PHASE TWO</b>		
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DK's ABOARD</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DK's ASHORE</b>
USS TORTUGA	2	2 (Supporting all three ships)
USS CARTER HALL	2	
USS GUNSTON HALL	2	

<b>Table 5.9.2</b>		
<b>CNSP PHASE TWO</b>		
<b>SHIP</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DK's ABOARD</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DK's ASHORE</b>
USS BON HOMME RICHARD	7	3
USS BOXER	7	3

#### RECOMMENDATION

1. Expand scope of study to multiple ships to test synergy.
2. POM and reprogram funds to support continued expansion and fleet rollout.

#### STATUS

1. Phase II ran from May through SEP 2000. Data analysis is incorporated in Section 4 of this report and indicates manning ashore could be reduced by 11% of manning required shipboard due to dedicated resources and higher production rates.
2. Appendix (F) is a draft ASDOF POM paper. Decision at ASDOF Summit in July 2000 was to submit under POM 04 after completion of Phase III of this study.

## **5.10. FINDING: PHASE III: EXPANSION TO INCLUDE PERSONNEL (PAPA)**

### **DISCUSSION**

CNSL and CNSP suggested a third phase to the prototype that would transfer personnel functions as well as disbursing functions ashore. As tools and technology improve, the possibility of successfully transferring personnel functions ashore increases. In particular, the NSIPS deployment scheduled in FY-01 will have a dramatic effect on PN functionality. CINC's want to test Phase III aboard three LSD's, and two LHD's starting in the 2<sup>nd</sup> QTR 2001 with a follow on test of two CVNs starting in FY02 unless funding is authorized to accelerate expansion in FY01. N1 buy in and support has been provided throughout the planning stages in support of PAPA. Appendix (I), the ASDOF Project Issue Paper, addresses the expansion of PAPA.

Even with the NSIPS deployment date delayed, the CINCs want to pursue PAPA Phase III now. Although the findings and data collected from the test may fluctuate upon NSIPS roll out, the consensus is to test now and adjust the findings to include NSIPS functionality upon rollout. Discussion was held with the Defense MILPAY Office (DMO) on 28 August 2000 to incorporate and test the DMO's software interface on these Navy ships. DMO is to replace the Uniform Microcomputer Disbursing System (UMIDS) in March 2001 and is to provide the port for data input into DJMS in 2002 and the DIMHRs pay module in the future. By changing the input document to DMO, the potential exists to further streamline the process by generating a flat file vice using a digital fax requiring re-keying ashore.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Add N1 as co-chair of working group due to the addition of personnel functionality.
2. Develop CONOPS to incorporate PN functionality.
3. Request \$210K to fund Phase III expansion for infrastructure and contractor support.

### **STATUS**

1. CINCLANT/CINCPAC N1 representatives were included in planning stages of PAPA. DMO was demonstrated on 21 NOV 00 and representatives from ASN-FM, NAVSUP, CINC/TYCOM N4 representatives attended. DMO was considered not ready for deployment.
2. Funding request for \$210,000 was submitted to Navy eBusiness Office on 3 NOV 00. Awaiting decision.

## Appendix A

### Disbursing Off Ship Working Group

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>FAX</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
<b>Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet:</b>			
CDR Barry Smith	(757) 836-6869	836-6713	smithbr@clf.navy.mil
CDR Diane Dubay	(757) 836-0482	836-6713	DubayMD@clf.navy.mil
<b>Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet:</b>			
CDR Claudia Butler	(808) 471-0434	474-5464	butlercs@cpf.navy.mil
<b>Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet:</b>			
CDR Paul Thayer	(757) 836-3290	836-3125	Pthayer@cnsl.spear.navy.mil
LCDR Frank Sarra	(757) 836-3171	836-3125	fsarra@cnsl.spear.navy.mil
DKC Victor Penson	(757) 836-3174	836-3125	Vpenon@cnsl.spear.navy.mil
<b>Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet:</b>			
LT Bernie Knox	(619) 437-3512	437-2265	knox.bernard.d@cnsn.navy.mil
DKCM Filoteo	(619) 437-5456	437-2265	filoteo.manuel.g@cnsn.navy.mil
<b>Naval Supply Systems Command (Code 56, Disbursing):</b>			
Barb Straw	(717) 605-7441	605-1631	barbara_c_straw@navsup.navy.mil
LT Paul Morris	(717) 605-3506	605-1631	paul_w_morris@navsup.navy.mil
CDR Joe Spruill	(703) 614-6850		N132D15@bupers.navy.mil
Don Wray	(717) 605-7575	605-1631	donald_t_wray@navsup.navy.mil
<b>Defense Finance and Accounting Service</b>			
Jon Cobb	(216) 522-6303	DSN: 580	jon.cobb@dfas.mil

## **Appendix B**

### **Disbursing Off Ships Standard Operating Procedures**



# **DISBURSING OFF SHIP STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES**

## **PERSONNEL PROCESSING**

### **GAINS AND LOSS**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Personnel office will process all gains and losses in a normal way, using UMIDS (bridge events).
2. Forward diskette including copy of PCS Accounting worksheet, travel itinerary, DD-214 and orders to Disbursing office.
3. Disbursing office will verify accuracy and completeness of documents.
4. Forward diskette and all supporting documents to PSA/PSD via email (scan documents).

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of diskette (attachment to Email) will download to UMIDS system.
2. Verify transactions and make corrections if necessary.
3. Upload files to DFAS-CL using FTP.
4. Will verify when files are applied to the MMPA, and correct rejected transactions.

### **OTHER PERSONNEL PAY IMPACTING DOCUMENTS**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Personnel office, will create/process all necessary FIDS transactions (i.e. SB03, 1103, 6501, etc.) in a normal way using UMIDS and saving files to a diskette.
2. Personnel supervisor will verify accuracy of documents and retain all supporting documents onboard.
3. Personnel office will forward diskette to disbursing.
4. Disbursing will forward diskette via email to PSA/PSD.

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of diskette will download to UMIDS system.
2. Verify transactions and make corrections if necessary.
3. Upload files to DFAS-CL using FTP and send feedback reports to the SHIP.
4. Will verify when files are applied to the MMPA, and correct rejected transactions.

### **MISCELLANEOUS MEMORANDUM DATA**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Personnel/Admin/Legal must utilize OPINS/NES direct access to BUPERS/NPC to process SRB pre-cert, Fleet reserve, Encore, UA processing, etc.
2. Personnel office should provide copy of documents to Disbursing.
3. Disbursing will forward documents (scan) to PSA/PSD.

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Will have secondary access in case SHIP cannot access due to "operational commitment".
2. Upon receipt of copy of documents, will verify MMPA if posted or make follow up action if necessary.

## **DISBURSING PROCESS**

### **PAY AND ALLOWANCES CHANGE**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Verify legality and accuracy of supporting documents submitted.
2. Forward (email/scan) all necessary PSA/PSD upon receipt from customer/personnel timely and on a regular basis. Required information:
  - ✓ **Name, SSN and rank/pay grade**
  - ✓ **Type of pay and allowance**
  - ✓ **Effective date of action**
  - ✓ **Action required (start/stop/change)**

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of required information will submit FID transaction to DFAS-CL.
2. Will verify when transaction is applied to the MMPA and make corrections if necessary.

### **ALLOTMENT/EFT/WITHOLDING TAX/LEGAL RESIDENCE CHANGE**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Verify and ascertain all required information is in the form (i.e. name of payee, account number, type, company code, etc.).
2. Forward document request to PSA/PSD on a timely manner, taking into consideration DFAS-CL updates (mid-month, end of month, MER).

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of document, will process and submit FID transaction to DFAS-CL.
2. Will verify when transaction is applied to the MMPA and make corrections if necessary.

### **SPLIT PAY OPTION**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Verify and provide accurate information on a timely manner to PSA/PSD.
2. Upon receipt of confirmation either from "RPR" report from DFAS-CL or PSA/PSD, will verify UMIDS to match Split Pay Option (SPO) amounts prior to uploading payday information (ATM Upload).

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of request, will process FID transaction to DFAS-CL.
2. Will verify when action completed and database provide feedback report of the change.

## **ACDUTRA**

### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Payments of pay and allowance for ACDUTRA will be processed onboard.
2. Travel claim processing will be forwarded to PSA/PSD with all required information (DD 1351-2, orders and endorsements, NC 2120, EFT information, etc.) on a timely manner.
3. Deliver/mail copy of travel voucher summary to member.

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of travel claim, will process using IATS.
2. Will forward copy of travel voucher summary.

## **MISCELLANEOUS DEBT COLLECTION**

### **SHIP ACTION**

1. For local collection of debts/overpayments (i.e. BAS collection, PAA, bounced checks, etc.), will provide PSA/PSD with all necessary information to effect Collections on member's pay account.
2. Upon receipt of information that a member has a "no surprise debt" (system generated DQ), will inform and provide due process to the member (i.e. reschedule, suspend collection, waiver of debt).
3. Upon completion of due process, will provide PSA/PSD necessary action to be taken (i.e. resume collection, suspend due to waiver, collect as scheduled).

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Upon receipt or required information, will submit FID transaction to DFAS-CL.
2. For system generated overpayments of pay and allowances (DQ), will inform SHIP based on "management report (XY03)" downloaded daily (JDC files) from DFAS-CL.
3. Will verify validity of debt and make necessary adjustments (credit) if warranted.
4. Provide feedback report to SHIP when action is completed and applied to MMPA.

## **PAY PRODUCTS AND MANAGEMENT REPORTS**

### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Will download DFAS-CL pay products (i.e. JDC, LES, NPA, RPR, etc.) on a daily basis or when files become available.
2. Convert all files received to the Evaluation and Analysis Reports system (EARS) for tracking and monitoring.
3. Upon receipt of feedback report, will provide PSA/PSD necessary information for action.
4. Maintain retain files of all reports for 12 months.

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Will download all available pay products and other various reports from DFAS-CL.
2. Updates and reconcile database accounts daily.
3. Review all reports and provide feedback reports to the SHIP.
4. Will provide any pay products and any information upon request to SHIP.
5. Maintain retain files for the whole duration of the test.

**Note: SHIP AND PSA/PSD will download "JDC" files from DFAS-CL and convert them to EARS. All "Management Notices" should be look at by both sites on a daily basis. Special attention directed to "UH03", "UC03", "UR03", "XY03" and "XD03".**

## **TAD/EMBARK PERSONNEL**

1. Officer in Charge of each detachment will monitor their respective members. Accountability of members actually onboard during deployment is their main responsibility with direct liaison with Personnel Department.
2. Officer in Charge/Admin support personnel will use "pay matrix" available on the PSA Web page for submission of pay and allowances changes.
3. There will be no change in the reporting procedure; parent PSD will submit "**LG04**" to transfer their accounts to the SHIP.
4. Memorandum or copy of manifest must be forwarded to SHIP and PSA/PSD. Both sites will update UMIDS database and include all TAD/Embark personnel.
5. PSA/PSD will submit corresponding FID (**LD01**) to DFAS-CL for inclusions in the ship's pay UIC.
6. All other related disbursing functions/request should be conducted onboard SHIP.

## **CUSTOMER SERVICE**

The SHIP will provide regular customer service. Specific issues and problem accounts should be referred to PSA/PSD for a face to face interaction between member and PSA/PSD representative. Dependents are welcome at PSA/PSD provided they have "**SPECIFIC POWER OF ATTORNEY**", addressing such as pay information, receive copy of Leave and Earnings Statement (LES) and net Pay Advice (NPA). However, dependents can not change, start, stop allotments and EFT information.

## **TRAVEL PROCESSING**

### **TRAVEL ADVANCE (TEMPORARY DUTY)**

#### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Disbursing Officer verifies legality, and accuracy of the TDY orders presented. If the traveler is a VISA cardholder, no advance is authorized. Do not forward requests. If the traveler is non-Visa cardholder, only 100% of MI&E and other miscellaneous expenses are payable. TDY orders must indicate the type of Meals Authorized (GMR, PMR or CMR).
2. Forward following documents to PSA/PSD via Email no more than 15 days before departure.
  - A. EFT Information (RTN, Acct. Nos., & Type of account).
  - B. Copy of TDY Orders
3. Endorse Original TDY Orders of payment information.

#### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Review documents received.
2. Process TDY Advance requests via IATS.
3. Correct any DFAS Reject on ADS
4. Advise Ship via E-mail of complete payment information. (Amount Paid, Date, DOV Number)

## **TRAVEL ADVANCE (PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION)**

### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Disbursing Officer verifies accuracy of Advance Travel Request Form and the validity of the PCS orders presented for payment
2. Forward all documents to PSA/PSD via E-mail no more than 30 days prior to detachment.
  - A. EFT Information (RTN, Acct. Nos., & Type)
  - B. PCS Travel Advance Request Form
  - C. PCS Orders
  - D. PCS Order Modification
3. Endorse Original PCS Orders of payment information.

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Review documents received.
2. Process PCS advance requests via IATS.
3. Correct any DFAS Rejects on ADS
4. Advise Ship via E-mail of complete payment information. (Amount Paid, Date, DOV Number).

## **TRAVEL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT**

### **SHIP**

1. Forward the following documents and information to PSA/PSD via E-mail.

#### **TDY CLAIMS**

- A. EFT Information (RTN, Acct. no, & Type)
- B. DD 1351-2, signed by Member and D.O.  
(Ensure all Advances received are indicated)
- C. TDY Orders (Front and Back)
- D. TDY Orders Modifications

#### **PCS CLAIMS**

- A. EFT Information (RTN, Acct. no, & Type)
- B. DD 1351-2, Signed by Member and D. O.  
(Ensure all Advances received are indicated)
- C. TLE claim form
- D. PCS Orders (Front and Back)
- E. PCS Orders Modifications

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Review accuracy and completeness of claim.
2. Input TDY/PCS claims via IATS.
3. Correct any DFAS Reject on ADS.
4. Scan and email copy of travel voucher summary to ship.

NOTE: (a) Receipts are not required. D.O. must verify the claim and receipts for completeness, accuracy and validity. Reimbursable expenses claimed by members can be approved in full, reduced, or disallowed by the D.O. After complete review and verification, return all receipts to the member for retention for 6 years 2 months.

(b) D.O. must always sign the Authorizing Officer Signature Block (24a) of the Travel Voucher (DD 1351-2) to certify accuracy, legality and approval of claim.

2. Deliver copies of Travel Voucher Summary and PCS orders to member and AO for service file upon receipt from PSA/PSD.
3. File Original TAD/PCS claim with D.O. and retain for future reference.

## **COLLECTION PROCEDURES FOR OVERPAID CLAIMS**

When claim settlement (PCS/TDY) resulted in overpayment, a letter of notification and voucher summary computation will be emailed back to the ship for delivery to member for review and due process.

### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Notify member of overpayment.
2. Determine how member wishes to repay indebtedness.
  - A. **Cash or Check**, The D.O. will collect funds and credit line of accounting.
  - B. **Pay Checkage**, The D.O will email PSA/PSD with required information. Upon receipt of check from DFAS-CL, process DD 1131 to credit line of accounting and E-mail PSA/PSD with the CV number and date to update IATS database.

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Scan and E-mail Collection Letter, Travel Voucher Summary, and Collection Voucher.
2. Prepare DS01 FID, using D.O. Company code.
3. Update IATS database of Collection voucher information.

## **SUBMISSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL CLAIM**

### **SHIP ACTION**

1. Upon receipt of travel voucher summary and the member determines that there is a possible error in computation and the D.O. agrees that more funds are payable, forward the following documents:

- A. DD 1351-2, signed by Member and D.O. and clearly marked SUPPLEMENTAL across the form.
- B. Copy of Orders (PCS/TAD)
- C. Copy of any modification to orders.

2. Deliver travel voucher summary to member or D.O as applicable for service record file.

### **PSA/PSD ACTION**

1. Determine validity and legality of supplemental claim.

2. Input claim via IATS.

3. Correct any DFAS Reject on ADS.

4. Scan and email Travel Voucher summary to ship.

**Appendix C**  
**Transaction Flow Charts**



## **Appendix D**

### **Consolidated EARS and DJMS Data**

## **Appendix E**

### **Transaction Error Rate Line Graphs**

## **Appendix F**

### **ASDOF Project POM Issue Paper**